

Sources for the Study of Liturgy in Post-Byzantine Jerusalem (638–1187 CE)

DANIEL GALADZA

In the interface between liturgy and history, scholars wrestle over whether manuscript sources accurately reflect the liturgy of the day and where those sources are to be found. Nowhere is this interface more fraught than with now-extinct liturgical practices in the Jerusalem Patriarchate after the Arab conquest (638 CE). These issues were raised as early as the nineteenth century. In a letter to A. A. Dmitrievskii (1856–1929), N. F. Krasnosel'tsev (1845–1898) discussed the identification of hagiopolite liturgical sources authentic to the period after the Arab conquest. Regarding the twelfth-century manuscript Hagios Stavros Graecus 43, a liturgical compendium from Jerusalem for the services of Holy Week, Pascha, and Bright Week known popularly as the *Typikon of the Anastasis*,¹ Krasnosel'tsev posed the problem:

Why would the *Ordo* be edited in the tenth century (and this fact is obvious) if it had no practical significance? In a word, it seems

obvious to me that certain parts of our *Ordo* had no practical use already from the time of the Muslim conquest but were not effaced from the text, and this question is now very important and interesting for us.²

Of “no practical use” were the indications of processions to churches and shrines among Jerusalem’s holy sites that putatively no longer existed in the period of Arab occupation.³ Although correct in many of their conclusions, Krasnosel'tsev and Dmitrievskii did not have the resources we now have at our disposal to make more precise conclusions regarding liturgy in Jerusalem and its manuscript sources.

1 A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, ed., “I. Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐκκλησίας,” in *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμητικῆς Σταχυολογίας* (St. Petersburg, 1894), 2:1–254. Strata of liturgical material in Hag. Stav. Gr. 43 can be traced back to the fourth, eighth, and tenth centuries. This, however, could be said of most Byzantine liturgical texts, which, by their conservative nature, retain older usages while accruing new material over time. Thus, we respect the dating of this manuscript to 1122 according to its colophon and treat its liturgical contents as reflecting twelfth-century practices. For more on the question of the dating of the contents of this manuscript, see below, 90.

2 “Для чего же тогда редактировался Уставъ въ X в. (а это несомнѣнно), если онъ не могъ имѣть практическаго значенія. Словомъ, мнѣ кажется несомнѣннымъ, что нѣкоторыя части нашего Устава не имѣли практическаго примѣненія уже со временъ мусульманскаго завоеванія, но не изглаживались изъ текста, и это для насъ теперь очень важно и любопытно.” Letter of 31 March 1896, from N. F. Krasnosel'tsev to A. A. Dmitrievskii, published in A. A. Dmitrievskii, *Древнѣйшіе Патріаршіе Типиконы Святогробскій Іерусалимскій и Великой Константинопольской Церкви: Критико-библіографическое изслѣдованіе* (Kiev, 1907), 71–73 n. 1. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own.

3 For more on Jerusalem’s stationary liturgy, see J. F. Baldovin, S.J., *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development, and Meaning of Stationary Liturgy*, OCA 228 (Rome, 1987), 45–104.

Robert Taft has frequently stated: “Knowledge in a field advances not by the accumulation of new data but by the invention of new systems.”⁴ Studies of liturgy in Jerusalem, however, have often overlooked liturgical sources arising between the eighth-century Georgian lectionary and the twelfth-century *Typikon of the Anastasis*. Restoring such large gaps in the data, namely collecting and describing hagiopolite liturgical sources from the eighth to twelfth centuries, is a required propaedeutic step in the study of hagiopolite liturgical history.⁵ Thus, no “new systems” can be developed until this task has been completed. Examination of these neglected liturgical sources, along with archaeological and historical data from this period—a period in which liturgical practice becomes a moving target in a changing landscape—nuances and supplements our knowledge of the liturgy of Jerusalem during the Studite and Sabaite synthesis and the phenomenon of liturgical Byzantinization to which Jerusalem was subjected.⁶

This paper draws attention to hagiopolite liturgical manuscripts from the period after the Arab conquest that are not usually included in studies of liturgy in Jerusalem. Close examination of these manuscripts within the historical context in which they were copied and used shows that previous frameworks of liturgical periodization of this era, as well as the study of liturgical development and evolution through synthesis and substitution, need to be reconsidered. Here I will briefly list according to language lesser-studied manuscripts of different liturgical books. Although these books vary in type, from lectionaries to Euchologia to hymnals, all of them are bound by a connection to the Jerusalem lectionary and its distinct calendar and order of scriptural readings. I will then consider these sources (1) in the context of liturgical historiography based on a more nuanced periodization of significant historical events in Jerusalem than that proposed by Miguel Arranz and Alexey Pentkovsky; (2) in relation to the Studite and Sabaite liturgical

synthesis; and (3) in the context of the phenomenon of liturgical Byzantinization.

Jerusalem's Liturgy and Its Lectionary

Many studies of liturgy in Jerusalem have followed “Ševčenko's Law of the Dog and the Forest”:⁷ one source attracts the amplified attention of many scholars while other, equally relevant sources are left uninvestigated. With regard to hagiopolite liturgy, there are generally four texts that have received the most attention: the travel diaries of the nun Egeria, dated between 381 and 384;⁸ the Armenian lectionary reflecting liturgical practice between 415 and 439;⁹ the Georgian lectionary from the fifth to eighth centuries;¹⁰ and the already mentioned *Typikon of the*

7 Attributed to Ihor Ševčenko. See S. Franklin and J. Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus, 750–1200* (London, 1996), xxi.

8 Egeria, *Journal de voyage: Itinéraire*, ed. P. Maraval, SC 296 (Paris, 1982).

9 A. Renoux, ed., *Le Codex Arménien Jérusalem 121*, vol. 1, *Introduction aux origines de la liturgie hiérosolymitaine: Lumières nouvelles*, PO 35.1 (Turnhout, 1969). The manuscripts Renoux used, described on 171–81, are: Jerusalem Armen. 121 (1192 and 1318, manuscript J in the apparatus) of the Couvent Saint-Jacques de Jérusalem; Paris Bibliothèque Nationale Armen. 44 (10th c. *terminus a quo*, manuscript P); and Yerevan Matenadaran Armen. 985 (10th c., manuscript E).

10 M. Tarchnishvili, ed., *Le grande lectionnaire de l'Église de Jérusalem (V^e–VIII^e siècle)*, CSCO 188–89 and 204–5 (Louvain, 1959–60). The manuscripts Tarchnishvili employed in his edition are: Paris Bibliothèque Nationale Ibericus 3 (10th–11th c.), employed by Tarchnishvili for §§ 16–729 and 766–1696 (manuscript P in the apparatus); Sinaiticus Ibericus O. 37 [Cagareli 30] (982), copied by the Sinaitic scribe Iovane Zosime (manuscript S in the apparatus); Mestia, Historic-Ethnographic Museum 51 (10th c.), “Lathal” manuscript copied by Iovane Zosime in his early period, probably at St. Sabas Lavra and used for §§ 1–53, 65–66, 83, 146–286, 325–589, 612–19, 644–898, 930–1019, 1055–1543, and 1668–72 (manuscript L); Tbilisi, Erovnuli Library 40 (10th c.), “Kala” [Lakurga] manuscript copied by Michael Čik'auri employed for §§ 355–882 (manuscript K); a seventh-century fragment from the University of Graz (manuscript Gr); and the palimpsest Tbilisi Ibericus 1831 (8th c., manuscript H). See the introduction by Tarchnishvili, *Grande lectionnaire*, CSCO 188, vi–xii. This edition has been incorporated into a new edition, now available online: *The Old Georgian Lectionary*, ed. J. Gippert, TITUS (Frankfurt am Main, 2004–2007), <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/ageo/lekt/lektpar/lektp.htm> (accessed 20 March 2012). For a detailed summary of the Georgian lectionary's contents, see H. Leeb, *Die Gesänge im Gemeinde-gottesdienst von Jerusalem (vom 5. bis 8. Jahrhundert)*, Wiener Beiträge zur Theologie 28 (Vienna, 1970), 23–26.

4 Taft is quoting Karl Popper here. See R. F. Taft, S.J., “The Structural Analysis of Liturgical Units: An Essay in Methodology,” in *Beyond East and West: Problems in Liturgical Understanding*, 2nd ed. (Rome, 1997), 187–202, here 190.

5 R. F. Taft, S.J., *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, vol. 4, *The Diptychs*, OCA 238 (Rome, 1991), xxx.

6 See *Cradle of Christianity*, Weisbord Exhibition Pavilion, Spring 2000–Winter 2001, ed. Y. Israeli and D. Mevorah (Jerusalem, 2000).

Anastasis, copied in 1122.¹¹ All of these sources have a connection to the Jerusalem lectionary, which served as much more than simply a repository of scriptural readings. The Jerusalem lectionary is comparable in its application and influence to the Constantinopolitan liturgical source known popularly as the *Typikon of the Great Church*.¹² Both are sources of liturgical texts, including hymnography and prayers from the Euchologion, as well as of liturgical structure and regulation, and their rubrics make reference to specific stations for synaxes.¹³ The rubrics of the Jerusalem lectionary describe stations within the Holy Sepulchre and the city of Jerusalem, demonstrating a clear hagiopolite provenance. From the sources of the Jerusalem lectionary we know that the Liturgy of the Word of the Eucharistic synaxis had from two to five scriptural readings from both the Old and New Testaments. For commemorations of Old Testament figures and multiple New Testament saints the hagiopolite Armenian lectionary prescribes an Old Testament reading followed by Acts or an Epistle, while only New Testament readings are stipulated for the commemoration of an individual New Testament figure.¹⁴ These sources also indicate variable hymnody proper to Jerusalem for the Liturgy of the Eucharist, for example the Hymn “of the Holy [Gifts]” (τῶν ἁγίων [δῶρων]; სიწმიდისად, *sicmidisay*) during the transfer of the gifts at the Great Entrance.¹⁵

These hagiopolite characteristics reveal significant differences between the lectionary systems of Jerusalem and Constantinople. Most recently Sebastia Janeras

has sought to employ these varying traits in order to determine the provenance of liturgical manuscripts.¹⁶ The lections of the Sunday gospel cycles of the two traditions are as follows:

	Jerusalem	Constantinople
Paschal season	John	John
Easter Sunday Liturgy	Mark 15:42–16:8	John 1:1–17
After Pentecost	Matthew	Matthew
After Exaltation of the Cross (September 14)	Mark	Luke
During Lent	Luke	Mark

Although the Paschal season’s gospel readings began in Constantinople with the prologue from John (1:1–17) at the Easter Sunday Liturgy, Jerusalem prescribed gospel accounts of the resurrection of Christ from all four gospels for the week after Easter, deferring the start of the cycle of the Gospel of John until the following Sunday.¹⁷ Even within each Evangelist’s cycle, the two traditions follow a different order of pericopes. The two traditions also had different beginnings of the liturgical year: Jerusalem’s liturgical books began with Christmas (25 December) or Annunciation (25 March), while Constantinopolitan liturgical books began with Easter in the Kanonaria or 1 September in the Synaxaria. These are just a few of the differences between the two distinct Byzantine and Jerusalem pericope orders in lectionaries,¹⁸ which Kurt Aland classified separately.¹⁹ However, when

11 See note 1 above. For more on the *Typikon of the Anastasis*, see G. Bertonière, *The Historical Development of the Easter Vigil and Related Services in the Greek Church*, OCA 193 (Rome, 1972), 12–18.

12 J. Mateos, S.J., ed., *Le Typicon de la Grande Église: Ms. Sainte-Croix n° 40, X^e siècle*, OCA 165–66 (Rome, 1962–63).

13 For an analysis of the Jerusalem lectionary, see R. Zerfass, *Die Schrifillesung im Kathedraffizium Jerusalems* (Münster, 1968).

14 Renoux, *Codex Arménien*, 35–36.

15 K. Kekelidze, *Иерусалимский Канонарь VII века (Грузинская версия)* (Tbilisi, 1912), 338; Tarchnishvili, *Grande lectionnaire*, §§ 1468, 1492; Papadopoulos-Kerameus, “Τυπικόν” (n. 1 above), 25, 107, 188, 201; Leeb, *Gesänge*, 113–24; R. F. Taft, S.J., *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, vol. 2, *The Great Entrance: A History of the Transfer of Gifts and Other Preanaphoral Rites*, 4th ed., OCA 200 (Rome, 2004), 72–76; C. Renoux, “L’hymne des saints dons dans l’Octoéchos géorgien ancien,” in *Θυσία ἀνέσεων: Mélanges liturgiques offerts à la mémoire de l’Archevêque Georges Wagner (1930–1993)*, ed. J. Getcha and A. Lossky (Paris, 2005), 293–313.

16 S. Janeras, “Les lectionnaires de l’ancienne liturgie de Jérusalem,” *Collectanea Christiana Orientalia* 2 (2005): 71–92. See also S. Verhelst, *Le lectionnaire de Jérusalem: Ses traditions judéo-chrétiennes et son histoire*, Spicilegii Friburgensis Subsidia 24 (Fribourg, 2012). For an earlier study of the Sunday lectionary cycle, see A. Baumstark, “Die sonntägliche Evangelienlesung im vorbyzantinischen Jerusalem,” *BZ* 30 (1929): 350–59. For more on the Constantinopolitan lectionary, see E. Velkovska, “Lo studio dei lezionari bizantini,” *Ecclesia Orans* 13 (1996): 253–71.

17 See S. Janeras, “I vangeli domenicali della resurrezione nelle tradizioni liturgiche agiopolite e bizantina,” in *Paschale Mysterium: Studi in memoria dell’Abate Prof. Salvatore Marsili (1910–1983)*, ed. Giustino Farnedi, Studia Anselmiana 91 (Rome, 1986), 55–69.

18 For further liturgical distinctions between the two lectionaries, see Janeras, “Lectionnaires,” 83–90.

19 See *Kurzgefaßte Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, ed. K. Aland, Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen

Aland uses the term “jerusalemische Reihenfolge” (Jerusalem order) to label certain lectionaries, he does not elaborate upon the structure and content of this order, nor does Caspar René Gregory’s foundational *Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes*, which presents only the Byzantine lectionary order.²⁰ Although the hagiopolite sources show greater variety in the content of the lectionary, they are guided by the principle described by Egeria, that the preaching, reading of scripture, and hymns are appropriate to the day and place,²¹ in both cathedral and monastic worship within the Jerusalem patriarchate.

Language Groups and Their Liturgical Manuscripts in the Jerusalem Patriarchate

On her visit to Jerusalem Egeria noted separation and unity among the diverse language groups in Jerusalem, and mainly between the Greek and Syriac groups. Greek was used as the primary liturgical language and Syriac translations were provided for the local population.²² This multilingualism was also reflected in monasteries. For example in the *Life of St. Sabas*, Armenian monks are said to have been permitted to serve the canonical hours (τῆς ψαλμωδίας κανόνα)²³ in their own language (τῇ τῶν Ἀρμενίων διαλέκτῳ), but were to join the Greeks for the Divine Liturgy, indicated here by the term προσκομιδή.²⁴

Textforschung 1 (Berlin, 1994), xiii–xix, for an explanation of Aland’s abbreviations for classifying lectionaries.

20 C. R. Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes* (Leipzig, 1900–1909), 1:343–84.

21 Egeria, *Journal de voyage*, 25.10, 29.2, 47.5.

22 Ibid., 47.3–5.

23 For an explanation of this term, see A. A. Dmitrievskii, “Что такое канон τῆς ψαλμωδίας, так нерѣдко упоминаемый въ жизнеописаніи препод. Саввы Освященнаго?” *Руководство для сельскихъ пастырей* 38 (1889): 69–73.

24 “ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς θείας προσκομιδῆς ἔρχεσθαι μετὰ τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν καὶ τῶν θείων μεταλαμβάνειν μυστηρίων”: Cyril of Skythopolis, *Leben des Sabas*, ed. E. Schwartz, TU 49.2 (Leipzig, 1939), 117. The term προσκομιδή introduces the Anaphora of the Liturgy of St. James in some liturgical manuscripts. See B.-C. Mercier, ed., *La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine*, PO 26.2 (Paris, 1946), 184. For an explanation of the term, see S. Parenti, “Nota sull’impiego del termine προσκομιδή nell’*euclologio* Barberini gr. 336 (VIII sec.),” *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 103 (1989): 406–17, and P. Koumarios, “Prothesis and Proskomide:

The same practice is repeated in a twelfth-century transcription of the *Typikon of St. Sabas Lavra*, considered the will and testament of the founder, St. Sabas (439–532), himself. The description of liturgical services within the monastery is as follows:

Nor shall it be permitted that the Iberians, or the Syrians, or the Franks celebrate a complete liturgy in their churches. Let them instead gather over there, and sing the canonical hours and Typika in their own language, and read the Apostle and the Gospel as well, and then go to the Great Church and take part in the divine, undefiled, and life-giving sacraments together with the whole brotherhood.²⁵

The “complete liturgy” consisted of the Liturgy of the Word with epistle and gospel readings in various languages in separate chapels and then the partaking of the sacrament together in the Liturgy of the Eucharist within the Lavra’s Great Church, dedicated to the Annunciation. The Anaphora that the multilingual monastic brotherhood would celebrate was probably until the twelfth century, at least for major feasts, still the Liturgy of St. James (JAS),²⁶ as opposed to the

A Clarification of Liturgical Terminology,” *GOTR* 52 (2007): 63–102, esp. 68–72.

25 *BMFD* 4:1316, Fiaccadori’s translation, with my emendations (my thanks to Dr. Vassa Larin for noting the mistranslation of τὰ τυπικά). “Μὴ ἔχειν δὲ ἐξουσίαν μήτε τοὺς Ἰβήρας, μήτε τοὺς Σύρους, ἢ τοὺς Φράγγους λειτουργίαν τελείαν ποιεῖν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ συναθροισμένους ἐν αὐταῖς ψάλλειν τὰς ὥρας καὶ τὰ τυπικά, ἀναγινώσκειν δὲ τὸν Ἀπόστολον καὶ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τὴν μεγάλην ἐκκλησίαν καὶ μεταλαμβάνειν μετὰ πάσης τῆς ἀδελφότητος τῶν θείων καὶ ἀχράντων καὶ ζωοποιῶν μυστηρίων.” Sin. Gr. 1096 (12th–13th c.): A. A. Dmitrievskii, *Описание литургических рукописей, хранящихся въ библиотекахъ православнаго востока*, vol. 1, *Τυπικά* (Kiev, 1895), 222–23. The reference to “Franks” may be a much later interpolation of the original text.

26 According to Theodore Balsamon: “. . . πρῶτος ὁ ἅγιος Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἀδελφός τοῦ πρώτου ἀρχιερατεύσας τῆς Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν Ἐκκλησίας παρέδωκε τὴν θείαν ἱεροτελεσίαν, ἥτις παρ’ ἡμῖν ἀγνοεῖται, παρὰ δὲ τοῖς Ἱεροσολυμίταις καὶ τοῖς Παλαιστινίοις ἐνεργεῖται ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις ἑορταῖς” (PG 137:621B). For the persistence of JAS in the Jerusalem Patriarchate, see C. Charon, “Le rite byzantine et la liturgie chrysostomienne dans les patriarchats Melkites (Alexandrie–Antioche–Jérusalem),” in *Χρυσόστομος: Studie e ricerche in trono a S. Giovanni Crisostomo, a cura del comitato per il XV° centenario della sua morte, 407–1907*, (Rome,

Liturgy of St. Basil the Great (BAS) or the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom (CHR). The readings and hymns of the Liturgy of the Word are found in sources containing elements of the Jerusalem lectionary, as one might expect. In order to better understand these sources, it is necessary to examine them according to the various language groups in which they were used, to look for differences, and to understand the similarities between the linguistic groups. Similarities would reveal hagiopolite practices common to all the linguistic groups, while differences between the sources would uncover traditions of particular language groups or glimpses of hagiopolite liturgy at different stages of development.

Greek

Cyril Mango's article on the revival of Greek literary culture in Palestine in the eighth century²⁷ caught the attention of palaeographers and stimulated further examination of Greek manuscripts originating in Jerusalem and Palestine. Ensuing research revealed a corpus of liturgical manuscripts connected by a distinct ogival majuscule script, of which the Uspensky Psalter (Petropolitanus GPB Graecus 216 + Sinaiticus Graecus N.E. MG 33) of 862/63 is perhaps the most famous example.²⁸ Those Greek manuscripts having a direct link to the Jerusalem lectionary are included here.

SINAITICUS GRAECUS 210

[WITH ADDITIONAL FRAGMENTS] (861/62)

A fragmentary uncial script selected gospel lectionary (ἐκλογάδιον) according to the Jerusalem pericope order survives on four parchment fragments:²⁹ Sin. Gr.

210 (188 fols.), Sin. Gr. N.E. MG 12, Σπ. (31 fols.),³⁰ St. Petersburg, Akad.-Bibl., K'pel 194 (4 fols.),³¹ and Sin. Gr. Harris Appendix 16.22 (3 fols.).³² Both the large dimensions (approximately 350 × 210 mm) and the ink decoration of the manuscript³³ suggest it was used for solemn occasions or in a prestigious environment, such as the cathedral of a bishop or the main church of a monastery. On one verso of Sin. Gr. N.E. MG 12, Σπ. there is a damaged inscription, which reads:

To the glory and praise of the holy, consubstantial, uncreated, and life-creating Trinity, Father and Son and Holy Spirit, and to the world and the glory of the most-holy church . . . wrote and completed the sacred and holy selection (ἐκλογάδιον) of the holy gospels of all the feasts along with Sundays of the whole year. [In the] month . . . [in the] year of the [creation of the] world from Adam, 6370 [861/62], of the Indiction . . . by the zeal and toil and will . . . of the beloved by Christ, brother and deacon of the church of the all-praised Apostles, written in the monastery of our holy father . . .³⁴

Jerusalem pericope order (Jerus.) was filled in by a later hand (†): U-lsel † (Jerus.). The fragments that make up Sin. Gr. 210 are labelled I 844 + I 1271 + I 1273: Aland, *Kurzgefaßte Liste* (n. 19 above), 269. See also D. Harlfinger, D. R. Reinsch, and J. A. M. Sonderkamp, with G. Prato, *Specimina Sinaitica: Die datierten griechischen Handschriften des Katharinen-Klosters auf dem Berge Sinai, 9. bis 12. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1983), 13–14, frontispiece, and tab. 1–4.

30 Ibid., 13, indicates 19 fols., while Aland, *Kurzgefaßte Liste*, 269, indicates 31 fols. Smaller fragments of the manuscript are not indicated in *Tā νέα εύρήματα του Σινᾶ*, ed. P. G. Nikolopoulos et al. (Athens, 1998).

31 These folios have been published in *Описание Рукописного Отдела Библиотеки Академии Наук СССР*, vol. 5, *Греческие Рукописи*, ed. N. N. Lebedeva (Leningrad, 1973), 19–20.

32 Aland, *Kurzgefaßte Liste*, 269.

33 L. Brubaker, "Greek Manuscript Decoration in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries: Rethinking Centre and Periphery," in *I manoscritti greci tra riflessione e dibattito: Atti del V Colloquio Internazionale di Paleografia Greca (Cremona, 4–10 ottobre 1998)*, vol. 2, ed. G. Prato, *Papyrologia Florentina* 31 (Florence, 2000), 513–33, esp. 516–23.

34 "εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἔπαινον τῆς ἁγίας ὁμ[ο]ουσίου ἁκτίστου κ[αὶ] ζωοποιῦ τριάδος· [π](α)τ[ρ](ὸ)ς καὶ υ(ἰ)ὸς καὶ ἅγιον πν(εύ)ματος καὶ εἰς κόσμον καὶ εὐκλαιοῖαν τῆς ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας . . . ἐγράφη καὶ ἐτέλε[ι] ὡθὴ τὸ ἱερὸν [καὶ] ἅγιον ἐκλογάδιον τ[ῶν] ἁγίων εὐαγγελίων πασῶν τῶν ἑορτ[ῶν] ἅμα καὶ κυριακῶν [τοῦ] ὅλου ἔτους.

1908), 473–718, here 495. It should be noted that Charon provides an erroneous reference for the citation from Balsamon.

27 C. Mango, "Greek Culture in Palestine after the Arab Conquest," in *Scrittura, libri e testi delle aree provinciali di Bisanzio*, Atti del Seminario di Erice (18–25 settembre 1988), ed. G. Cavallo, G. De Gregorio, and M. Maniacci (Spoleto, 1991), 149–60.

28 L. Perria, "Scritture e codici di origine orientale (Palestina, Sinai) dal IX al XIII secolo," *RSBN* 36 (1999): 19–33. For analysis of the liturgical content of those manuscripts, the Sinai "new finds," see P. Géhin and S. Frøyshov, "Nouvelles découvertes sinaitiques: À propos de la parution de l'inventaire des manuscrits grecs," *REB* 58 (2000): 167–84.

29 According to the classification system of the *Kurzgefaßte Liste*, this uncial script (U) lectionary (I) of readings for selected days (sel), as opposed to a continuous text, according to the

Linos Politis says the monastery mentioned may be that of St. Sabas.³⁵ Dieter Harlfinger, Diether Roderich Reinsch, and Joseph A. M. Sonderkamp do not dismiss this suggestion since the gospel lectionary “betrays the Palestinian textual tradition by its content, and also serves as an important witness of a large group of Palestinian-Sinaitic codices written in inclined ogive uncial through its script and binding.”³⁶

Because the additional folios are fragmentary, it is difficult to recreate the correct order of the manuscript’s folios and contents as a whole.³⁷ Nevertheless, Sin. Gr. 210 contains gospel readings beginning with the eve of Christmas and Theophany (fols. 11r–18r), proceeding to six Sundays of the Gospel of Luke (18r–25r). Next come Hypapante and Lent (25r–64r), followed by the Saturday and Sunday of Palms (64v–75v), Holy Week (75v–146v), six Resurrectional gospels (146v–155v), and Easter and Pentecost (155v–171v). The manuscript ends with the period from Pentecost until the Exaltation of the Cross (171v–188v). While Janeras has studied parts of this liturgical source,³⁸ the complete text of Sin. Gr. 210 remains to be edited.

SINAITICUS ARABICUS 116 (995/96)

A bilingual Greek-Arabic gospel book containing readings according to the Jerusalem lectionary³⁹ was copied by a monk and presbyter of the Monastery of

Mount Sinai. The monastery was located in a region that fell under the jurisdiction and liturgical influence of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem until 1575.⁴⁰ The manuscript colophon (fol. 205v) reads as follows:

[In Greek] Remember, Lord, your servant John, presbyter of Mount Sinai, son of Victor of Damietta. Amen. So be it.

[In Arabic] Remember, Lord, your servant, the sinner John, presbyter of Mount Sinai, son of Victor *blmla*⁴¹ of Damietta. He wrote it for himself and for those who read from it after him. And he prays that all who read from it may have mercy on him. And he wrote it in the year 385 [= 5 February 995 to 24 January 996]. And he became a monk in this place in the year 374 [= 4 July 984 to 23 May 985].⁴²

The peculiarities of the majuscule script by Presbyter John’s Greek hand suggest that he was more familiar writing Arabic than he was writing Greek.⁴³

The manuscript’s 207 folios open with a reading for an evening water blessing (fol. 11r) followed by the Easter cycle, which begins with the first Sunday after Pascha, New Sunday (νέα κυριακή, 21r). The Sunday cycle of John (21r–231r) then moves to the cycle of Matthew,

μη(νός) . . . ἔτους κόσμου ἀπὸ ἀ]δάμ . [ςτ]ο’ ἰ[ν]δ(ικτιώνος) . . . σπουδῇ καὶ π[όν]ου καὶ προθυμίᾳ. [. . . φίλο]χρίστου ἀδ[ελ]φοῦ καὶ διακόνου [ναοῦ τῶν] πανευφύμ[ων ἀποστόλων] ἐγράφη ἐν τῇ μ[ονῇ τοῦ] ἀγίου π(α)ρ(δ)ς ἡμῶ[ν].” Transcription with proposed missing text from Harlfinger et al., *Specimina Sinaitica*, 13.

35 L. Politis, “Nouveaux manuscrits grecs découverts au Mont Sinai,” *Scriptorium* 34 (1980): 5–17, here 10–11.

36 “Wie dem auch sei, unser Evangelienlektionar ist nicht nur inhaltlich ein Vertreter der palästinensischen Texttradition . . . sondern auch in Schrift und Buch ein wichtiger Zeuge einer größeren Gruppe von palästinensisch-sinaitischen Codices in rechtsgeneigter Spitzbogenmajuskel”: Harlfinger et al., *Specimina Sinaitica*, 14. For more on manuscripts of this script, see Perria, “Scritture e codici,” 23–24.

37 Harlfinger et al., *Specimina Sinaitica*, 13.

38 S. Janeras, *Le Vendredi-Saint dans la tradition liturgique byzantine: Structure et histoire de ses offices*, *Analecta Liturgica* 13 (Rome, 1988), 83–90, 39–40, 84–85, 201–2; Janeras, “Lectionnaires,” 71–92, here 80.

39 I 2211: U-lsel (Jerus., g-arb), approximately 208 × 150 mm: Aland, *Kurzgefaßte Liste*, 356. See also D. Harlfinger et al., *Specimina Sinaitica*, 17–18 and tab. 18–22.

40 The bishop of Pharan, resident at the Monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, was granted autonomy in 1575 by the Patriarch of Constantinople. See “Provincia Palestinae Tertiae: 101.12.3. Pharan, Sinai Mons, Monasterio di S. Caterina,” in G. Fedalto, *Hierarchia Ecclesiastica Orientalis*, vol. 2 (Padua, 1988), 1044–1045, and vol. 3 (Padua, 2006), 427. For more information on the relations between the hierarchy of Sinai and other patriarchates, see L. Cheikho, S.J., “Les Archevêques du Sinaï,” *Mélanges de la faculté orientale* 2 (1907): 408–21.

41 Or *tlmla*, *tlmla*, *nlmla*, or *ylmla*; a proper name.

42 “μνήσθητι κ(ύρι)ε τοῦ δούλου σοῦ Ἰω(άννου) πρεσβυτέρου ὁρὺς Σινᾶ υ(τὸ)ς Βίκτωρος ταμιαθέου ἀμὴν γένυτο [sic] . . . Memento, o Domine, servi tui peccatoris Iohannis (*yhns*) presbyteri in Monte Sina, filii Victoris (*btqr*) *blmla* Damiatensis; scripsit eum pro se ipso et pro (eis) qui legent in eo post eum; et ille rogat omnes qui legent in eo ut miserantur super eum. Et scripsit in anno trecentesimo octogesimo quinto ex annis Arabum. Et monachus-factus-est in hoc loco in anno trecentesimo septuagesimo quarto ex annis Arabum.” The Greek text and Arabic translation into Latin are from G. Garitte, “Un évangélaire grec-arabe du X^e siècle (Cod. Sin. ar. 116),” in *Studia Codicologica*, ed. Kurt Treu, TU 124 (Berlin, 1977), 207–25, here 208–9. The copyist is referring to years of the Hegira. See V. Grumel, *La chronologie*, *Traité d’études byzantines* 1 (Paris, 1958), 286–87.

43 Garitte, “Évangélaire,” 208.

which runs from Pentecost until the Exaltation of the Cross (ἀπὸ τῆς πεντεκόστης ἕως τοῦ σταυροῦ, 23v–48v). The next cycle of Mark begins after the Exaltation and continues until Christmas (ἀπὸ τῆς ὑψώσεως τοῦ τιμίου σταυροῦ ἕως τῶν γενέθλιων, 48–77v). Then the cycle of Luke begins, running from Theophany until Meatfare Sunday (ἀπὸ τῶν Θεοφανίων ἕως τῶν ἀπόκρεων, 77v–90v). Afterward come the fixed commemorations of the liturgical year from Christmas until Hypapante (93r–112r), the Lenten cycle and Holy Week (112r–152r), and then the eight Resurrection gospels (152r–166r). The Easter cycle concludes (166r–171r) and then come the fixed commemorations of the liturgical year that fall in the summer months of June, August, and September (171r–183v). The remainder of the codex contains readings for various general commemorations (183v–205v).

In addition to the use of the Jerusalem pericope order, the technical term Hyperthesis (ὑπέρθεσις) for the Friday before Palm Sunday connects this gospel book to Jerusalem liturgical practice. The Arabic rubric for this same day in Sin. Ar. 116 (995/96) indicates that this was the conclusion of Great Lent.⁴⁴ Apart from Sin. Ar. 116, Gérard Garitte indicates three other occurrences of the term Hyperthesis: the Greek Life of St. Stephen the Sabaite (d. 794),⁴⁵ the Arabic version of the same vita,⁴⁶ and Sin. Gr. 210 (see above).⁴⁷ A manuscript containing the Greek vita states that Lent ended on the day of Hyperthesis (τῆς τεσσαρακοστῆς πληρωθείσης ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ὑπερθέσεως), a term explained in a marginal note by a contemporary, tenth-century hand as being the name for the Friday before Lazarus Saturday in Jerusalem.⁴⁸

44 “Legitur in fine ieiunii,” fol. 129v: Garitte, “Évangélique,” 219. The word ὑπέρθεσις means “superior position” or “extension of a fast.” See C. Du Cange, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae graecitatis* (Graz, 1958), 1638, and G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1961), 1439. For more on this commemoration in Jerusalem, see S. Janeras, “Le vendredi avant le Dimanche des Palmes dans la tradition liturgique hagiopolite,” *Studi sull’Oriente Cristiano* 4, no. 1 (2000): 59–86.

45 BHG 1670.

46 “. . . hebdomada hypertheseos (’brt’s) quae est ante Palmas”: Sinai Arabicus 505 (13th c.), fol. 202v; G. Garitte, “Le début de la vie de S. Étienne le Sabaite retrouvé en arabe au Sinai,” *AB* 77 (1959): 338 n. 2.

47 fol. 64r. See Garitte, “Évangélique,” 219 n. 66.

48 “λέγουσι τὴν παρασκευὴν τοῦ Λαζάρου οἱ ἀγιοπολῖται ὑπέρθεσιν”: Paris. Coislin Graecus 303 (10th c.); Garitte,

SINAITICUS GRAECUS N.E. MG 8 (10TH C.)

An incomplete manuscript (46 fols.), Sin. Gr. N.E. MG 8 contains epistle and gospel readings in the Jerusalem pericope order as well as troparia and Old Testament readings for the Eucharistic liturgy on selected days of the year, from 25 December until the third Sunday of Lent, as well as the first Sunday of Matthew.⁴⁹ This manuscript is the only known Greek example of the Jerusalem lectionary to include Old Testament readings at a Sunday Eucharistic liturgy. Arabic rubrics throughout the manuscript suggest it was used within the Jerusalem Patriarchate. The presence of epistle readings and Arabic marginal notes reveal similarities between Sin. Gr. N.E. MG 8 and another lectionary, Sinaiticus Graecus 212 (9th c.).⁵⁰ While the text is written in characteristically Palestinian inclined ogival majuscule script,⁵¹ Panagiotis Nikolopoulos has identified the underwriting of a palimpsest in minuscule script containing readings from the Old Testament, along with troparia.⁵²

OTHER GREEK MANUSCRIPTS

A source that seems to have escaped Lidia Perria’s attention is Petropolitanus RNB Graecus 44 (9th c.), which Jean-Baptiste Thibaut dubbed “Codex Sinaiticus L” in recognition of its value for the study of ekphonic musical notation. The manuscript contains propers for the Liturgy of the Word for general commemorations of saints and certain Sundays of the year according to the sequence of the Jerusalem lectionary.⁵³ Two more manuscripts with palaeographic connections to the Palestinian corpus of liturgical

“Évangélique,” 219 n. 66.

49 The classification of this manuscript is *l* 2212: U-*l*^asel (Jerus.). Aland notes that the fragments Sinaiticus Graecus Σπ. MG 22 belong to Sin. Gr. NE MG 8. See Aland, *Kurzgefaßte Liste*, 356. However, Nikolopoulos’s catalogue does not include fragments (σπαράγματα) that have been stored separately from their corresponding manuscripts. There is no agreement between shelf marks of manuscripts and fragments in the Sinai “new finds.” For a confirmation, see A. K. Kazamias, *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ Ἁγίου Τακάβου τοῦ Ἀδελφοθέου καὶ τὰ νέα σιναιτικὰ χειρόγραφα* (Thessaloniki, 2006), 67–70.

50 *l* 846: U-*l*^asel (Jerus.): Aland, *Kurzgefaßte Liste*, 269.

51 Perria, “Scrittura,” 25.

52 *Νέα εὐρήματα*, ed. Nikolopoulos et al., 142 and tab. 51.

53 J.-B. Thibaut, *Monuments de la notation ekphonétique et hagiopolite de l’église Grecque* (St. Petersburg, 1913), 17–30 and appendix 1–11.

manuscripts require further study before more can be said about their connections to hagiopolite liturgy and the Jerusalem lectionary. The first is an eighth- or ninth-century Tropologion (Sinaiticus Graecus N.E. MT 56 taken with Sinaiticus Graecus N.E. MT 5) following the canon (κανών) of the Church of the Anastasis in Jerusalem⁵⁴ and the second is a contemporaneous Euchologion (Sinaiticus Graecus N.E. MT 53) believed to be of hagiopolite origin.⁵⁵

Syriac

Until the ninth or tenth century the term *Syriac* served to designate speakers of Christian Palestinian Aramaic and Arabic in Palestine.⁵⁶ From Egeria's time until the twelfth century, Syriac had a prominent place in the daily life of Jerusalem, as witnessed by another directive of St. Sabas's testament:

Since in the act of the nomination of the superiors pernicious demons are accustomed to raise disagreements and divisions between the two languages (I mean between Romans [i.e. Byzantines] and Syrians), in order to get rid of this scandal, we ordain that no Syrian should be appointed to the office of superior; but we both decide and accept that Syrians, being more efficient and practical in their native country, should be preferred for the

stewardship and treasurership as well as for other ministries.⁵⁷

Despite their efficiency and practicality, Syrians were never permitted to be abbots in monasteries and thus Syriac never held liturgical primacy within the multilingual monastic communities of Palestine or the Church of the Anastasis in Jerusalem. This may help explain why very few Syriac liturgical manuscripts show a clear connection to the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem. The fact that not all Syriac- and Arabic-speaking Christians were Melkite Christians who shared the Chalcedonian faith promoted by Constantinople can also explain the scarcity of Syriac and Arabic liturgical sources with an evident connection to the Chalcedonian Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem.⁵⁸ The majority of surviving Syriac liturgical manuscripts reflect the East and West Syrian liturgical traditions, which had closer ties to Antioch.⁵⁹ Sinaiticus Syriacus M52N, a manuscript with closer ties to Jerusalem, is described below.

57 “Ἐπεὶ δὲ φθοροποιοὶ δαίμονες ἐν ταῖς προχειρήσεσι τῶν ἡγουμένων εἰώθασι δειχνῶντας καὶ στάσεις ἀναρύπτειν τῶν δύο γλωσσῶν, μετὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων τε φημί καὶ Σύρων, ἐκ μέσου τὸ σκάνδαλον ἐξελαύνοντες, διορίζομεθα· μηδένα τῶν Σύρων ἀπὸ γε τοῦ νῦν τῆς τοῦ ἡγουμένου ἐπιβαίνειν ἀρχῆς, οἰκονόμους δὲ καὶ δοχειαρίους καὶ εἰς τὰς λοιπὰς διακονίας προτιμᾶσθαι τοὺς Σύρους καὶ διαταττόμεθα καὶ ἀποδεχόμεθα, ὡς ἀνυστικωτέρους ὄντας καὶ δραστικούς ἐν ταῖς πατρὰ(ι)σιν αὐτῶν”: Dmitrievskii, *Onucanie*, 1:224. For the English translation, see *BMFD* 4:1317.

58 N. El Cheikh and C. E. Bosworth, “Rûm,” *EP*, 8:601–6; S. H. Griffith, “The Church of Jerusalem and the ‘Melkites’: The Making of an ‘Arab Orthodox’ Christian Identity in the World of Islam (750–1050 CE),” in *Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land: From the Origins to the Latin Kingdoms*, ed. O. Limor and G. G. Stroumsa (Turnhout, 2006), 175–204; J. Pahlitzsch, “Griechisch–Syrisch–Arabisch: Zum Verhältnis von Liturgie- und Umgangssprache bei den Melkiten Palästinas im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert,” in *Language of Religion–Language of the People: Medieval Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, ed. Ernst Bremer et al., *Mittelalter-Studien* 11 (Munich, 2006), 37–47.

59 The two liturgical families that pray in Syriac are the East Syrian (Assyrian Church of the East, Ancient Church of the East, and Chaldean Catholic Church) and the West Syrian (Syrian Orthodox Church, Maronite Church, and, originally, Byzantine Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch) traditions. See S. P. Brock, “Manuscripts liturgiques en syriaque,” in *Les Liturgies syriaques*, ed. F. Cassingena-Trévedy and I. Jurasz, *Études syriaques* 3 (Paris, 2006), 267–83; idem, “Liturgy,” in *Gorgias Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Syriac Heritage*, ed. S. P. Brock, A. Butts, G. Kiraz, and L. Van Rompay (Piscataway, NJ, 2011), 248–51.

54 The two fragmentary codices were confirmed to belong to one and the same Tropologion by Stig Frøyshov during a visit to Sinai in April 2001. See S. R. Frøyshov, “L’Horologe ‘géorgien’ du Sinaiticus ibericus 34: Édition, traduction et commentaire” (Ph.D. diss., Université Paris-Sorbonne [Paris IV], 2004), 399. For a description of Sin. Gr. N.E. MT 5, see A. Nikiforova, “‘Сокрытое сокровище’: Значение находок 1975 года в монастыре вмц. Екатерины на Синае для истории служебной Минеи,” *Гимнология* 6 (Moscow, 2011), 8–31; eadem, *Из истории Минеи в Византии: Гимнографические памятники VII–XII вв. из собрания монастыря святой Екатерины на Синае* (Moscow, 2012), 195–235.

55 Géhin and Frøyshov, “Nouvelles découvertes sinaïtiques” (n. 28 above), 176–77. This manuscript is the subject of a doctoral dissertation being prepared by C. Kanavas at the Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome, Italy. See Pontificio Istituto Orientale, *Atti, Anno Accademico 2006–2007* (Rome, 2007), 48.

56 K. Leeming, “The Adoption of Arabic as a Liturgical Language by the Palestinian Melkites,” *ARAM* 15 (2003): 239–46, here 240–41.

SINAITICUS SYRIACUS M52N (9TH–10TH C.)

A rare Melkite calendar is preserved in Sin. Syr. M52N. It records fixed commemorations for the whole liturgical year (10 fols.), closely following the sanctoral of the Jerusalem lectionary, from 1 October (*tishrin*) until 30 September (*elul*).⁶⁰ The manuscript also contains a fragmentary lectionary (45 fols.).⁶¹ The lectionary assigns each day one, or at most two, commemorations, giving only the name of the saint or feast, and occasionally an epithet. While this genre of Syriac calendars is exclusively Jacobite according to all extant witnesses from the seventh through seventeenth centuries, the Syriac script of both parts of the manuscript is characteristically Melkite.⁶² Likewise, similarities between the commemorations in this calendar and those in the calendar of Sinaiticus Ibericus O. 34 (10th c.)⁶³ connect it with Jerusalem. André Binggeli's preliminary study stresses that this calendar is important for examining liturgy in Jerusalem between the integration of neo-martyrs of the Arab conquest into the sanctoral and the ultimate liturgical Byzantinization of Jerusalem's sanctoral.⁶⁴

Misleading Syriac Manuscripts

Although the provenance of extant Sinaitic Syriac liturgical manuscripts is very difficult to determine,⁶⁵ colophons of most Syriac Melkite liturgical manuscripts indicate they were copied in parts of Syria and

Cappadocia within the Antiochene Patriarchate, and not in Jerusalem. Regarding liturgical content, most contain CHR or BAS and very few contain JAS.⁶⁶ Thus they cannot be connected to hagiopolite liturgical practice. Despite their clear Antiochene provenance, the following Syriac manuscripts have been cited frequently as witnesses of Jerusalem liturgy.⁶⁷ This claim can no longer be accepted.

VATICANUS SYRIACUS 19 (1030)

A gospel book, written in Palestinian Syriac, provides a very detailed colophon:

I, Abbot Elias, presbyter, disciple of Abbot Moses, confirm to have written this Gospel and the books of the feasts, of the resurrection, and the six Menaia, to the service of the holy Church, and the rest of the books that I brought with me from Antioch in Arabia as a gift (*waqf*) for the monastery of St. Elias, known as the monastery of the star (*kawkab*), which I built. May this Gospel and books be for those who live in this monastery . . .⁶⁸

60 These are the Arabic names for the Syrian months. For a comparative table of Byzantine and Syrian months of the year, see Grumel, *Chronologie* (n. 42 above), 300–301.

61 Philothée du Sinai, *Nouveaux manuscrits syriaques du Sinai* (Athens, 2008), 501–20. This description corresponds to A. Binggeli, "Un ancien calendrier melkite de Jérusalem (Sinai syr. M52N)," in *Sur les pas des Araméens chrétiens: Mélanges offerts à Alain Desreumaux*, ed. F. Briquel Chatonnet and M. Debié (Paris, 2010), 181–94, which corrects parts of Sister Philothée's transcription.

62 Binggeli, "Ancien calendrier," 182.

63 G. Garitte, *Le calendrier palestinien-georgien du Sinaiticus 34 (X^e siècle)*, SH 30 (Brussels, 1958).

64 "Le principal intérêt de ce document réside donc dans le fait qu'il permet de remonter à un état du sanctoral de l'église Melkite d'avant la byzantinisation du rite dans le patriarcat de Jérusalem": Binggeli, "Ancien calendrier," 193.

65 N. Ševčenko, "Manuscript Production on Mount Sinai from the Tenth to the Thirteenth Century," in *Approaching the Holy Mountain: Art and Liturgy at St Catherine's Monastery in the Sinai*, ed. S. E. J. Gerstel and R. S. Nelson, *Cursor Mundi* 11 (Turnhout, 2010), 233–58.

66 Cf. S. P. Brock, *Catalogue of Syriac Fragments (New Finds) in the Library of the Monastery of Saint Catherine, Mount Sinai* (Athens, 1995), esp. 57–59; Philothée, *Nouveaux Manuscrits*.

67 See A. Baumstark, "Ausstrahlungen des vorbyzantinischen Heiligenkalenders von Jerusalem," *OCP* 2 (1936): 129–44, here 133–34; J. Nasrallah, "La liturgie des Patriarcats melchites de 969 à 1300," *OC* 71 (1987): 156–81, here 160.

68 "Io, abba Elia, presbitero, discepolo di abba Mosè, affermo di aver scritto questo Vangelo e i libri delle solennità, della resurrezione e i sei menci a servizio della santa Chiesa, e il resto dei libri che ho portato con me da Antiochia in Arabia come dono (*waqf*) per il monastero di S. Elia, conosciuto come il monastero della stella (*kawkab*), che è stato costruito da me. Che questo Vangelo e i libri siano per chi abita in questo monastero . . ." The original text of the now illegible manuscript is transcribed in S. E. Assemanus and J. S. Assemanus, *Bibliotheca apostolica vaticana codicum manuscriptorum catalogus: In tres partes distributas in quarum prima orientales in altera graeci in tertia latini italici aliorumque europaeorum idiomatum codices* (Rome, 1758, repr. Paris, 1926), 2:102. The Italian translation used here is from G. Lenzi, "46. Lezionario dei Vangeli: Aramaico palestinese," in *I Vangeli dei Popoli: La Parola e l'immagine del Cristo nelle culture e nella storia*, ed. F. D'Aiuto, G. Morello, and A. M. Piazzoni (Vatican City, 2000), 228–30, here 229, with corrections to the Assemani transcription. Arabic marginal notes written in *carsuni* explain pericopes throughout this manuscript. See Nasrallah, "Liturgie des Patriarcats melchites," 160.

Another note (fol. 194v) indicates that the manuscript was completed on Wednesday, 7 August 1030,⁶⁹ that Elias was from the town of 'Abūd, and describes Antioch as part of the region of 'Adqūs.

The wealth of geographic information contained in the text has attracted attention since the brothers Stephanus and Evodius Assemani initially described the manuscript in 1758.⁷⁰ The brothers believed 'Adqūs was a corruption of *Al-quds*, meaning Jerusalem.⁷¹ Francis Crawford Burkitt identified 'Adqūs and Kawkab as Dux (τὸ Δούξ) and Cavcas (Κάυκα), respectively. These are regions in Celesyria (Κολή Συρία) near Antioch mentioned by Anna Komnene (1083–1153) in the *Alexiad*.⁷² Burkitt also proposed that the monastery of St. Elias was the famous Lavra of St. Elias on the Black Mountain.⁷³ Sebastian Brock follows Burkitt on the origin of the manuscript, but disagrees that the monastery of St. Elias refers to the Black Mountain.⁷⁴ More recent studies have identified the monastery “of the star” (*kawkab*) to be 1.5 km from Abbot Elias’s home town of 'Abūd in Samaria, present-day Palestine.⁷⁵

The text of the manuscript, however, contains a structure similar to a Byzantine Rite gospel book and does not follow the Jerusalem lectionary order. The Kanonarion (fols. 1–147) follows the standard Byzantine order: the Paschal season and the cycle of John, then Matthew, Luke, and Mark, the Sundays of Lent, Holy Week, and eleven Resurrection gospels. The Synaxarion (148–194) begins with 1 September and ends with 31 August. Although the manuscript follows the basic structure of a Byzantine gospel

book,⁷⁶ certain elements, such as additional gospel readings for Vespers during the first week of Great Lent (78–80)⁷⁷ and the commemoration of several saints on days other than the standard Byzantine commemoration day, may be reminiscent of elements of a local, non-Constantinopolitan usage.⁷⁸ The manuscript is also a palimpsest with the underwriting in Greek minuscule of a Triodion.⁷⁹

VATICANUS SYRIACUS 20 (1216)

Anton Baumstark believed that a manuscript similar to Vat. Syr. 20, a gospel from Mount Senir near Damascus, served as a model for a Melkite calendar copied by the Arab polymath al-Bīrūnī (972/73–1050) in the eleventh century.⁸⁰ As with Vat. Syr. 19, however, this Evangelion is organized much like Byzantine Rite gospel books, beginning with the Kanonarion from Pascha and the cycle of John, and continuing with Matthew, Luke, and Mark. Peculiarities include alternate gospel readings from Luke for the third,

69 “Seventh day of Ab in the year of the Greeks 1341”: Lenzi, “Lezionario,” 229.

70 Assemanus, *Bibliotheca apostolica*, 2:70–103. See also F. M. Erizzo, *Evangelium Hierosolymitanum ex codice vaticano palestino* (Verona, 1864).

71 Assemanus, *Bibliotheca apostolica*, 2:101.

72 *Alexiad*, 13, 12.18, ed. D. R. Reinsch and A. Kambylis, *Annae Comnenae Alexias*, CFHB 40 (Berlin, 2001), 419.

73 F. C. Burkitt, “Christian Palestinian Literature,” *JTS* 2 (1901): 174–86, especially 178.

74 S. P. Brock, “Syriac Manuscripts Copied on the Black Mountain, near Antioch,” in *Lingua Restituta Orientalis: Festgabe für Julius Assfalg*, ed. R. Schulz and M. Görg (Wiesbaden, 1990), 59–67, here 62 n. 19.

75 Lenzi, “Lezionario,” 230.

76 “iuxta Ritus Syriacum Graecorum Melchitarum”: Assemanus, *Bibliotheca apostolica*, 2:70–103.

77 Ibid., 2:83.

78 Neither the Georgian Jerusalem lectionary nor Constantinopolitan sources, such as the *Typikon of the Great Church* or the Studite *Typikon*, indicate gospel readings for the Presanctified Liturgy during the first week of Great Lent. See Mateos, *Typikon* (see n. 12 above), 2:10–14. Although the Studite *Typikon* explicitly prescribes the Presanctified Liturgy for each day of Great Lent (“ἵνα ἐν τῇ ἑβδόμενῃ τῇ ἐκαστῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς μεγάλης νηστείας ἀναγινώσκωμεν τὴν εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἐκαστῆς ἡμέρας” [throughout all of Lent on every day they serve the Lenten Liturgy]), it does not prescribe gospel readings during the first week. See D. M. Petras, *The Typikon of the Patriarch Alexis the Studite: Novgorod-St. Sophia 1136* (Cleveland, 1991), 42; A. Pentkovskii, *Типикон патриарха Алексия Студита в Византии и на Руси* (Moscow, 2001), 239. See also S. Alexopoulos, *The Presanctified Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite: A Comparative Analysis of its Origins, Evolution, and Structural Components*, Liturgia Condenda 21 (Leuven, 2009), 62.

79 F. D’Aiuto, “Graeca in codici orientali della Biblioteca Vaticana,” in *Tra oriente e occidente: Scritture e libri greci fra le regioni orientali di Bisanzio e l’Italia*, ed. L. Perria, Testi e Studi Bizantino-Neoellenici 14 (Rome, 2003), 283–90, esp. 288–89 for the Greek text of the Triodion, and F. D’Aiuto, “Per la storia dei libri liturgico-innografici bizantini: Un progetto di catalogazione dei manoscritti più antichi,” *BollGrott* 3rd ser. 3 (2006): 53–66, here 61–63.

80 Abou Riḥān Al-Bīrūnī, *Les fêtes des Melchites*, ed. and trans. R. Griveau, PO 10.4 (Paris, 1915); Baumstark, “Ausstrahlungen,” 129–44; D. Galadza, “Liturgical Byzantinization in Jerusalem: Al-Bīrūnī’s Melkite Calendar in Context,” *BollGrott* 3rd ser. 7 (2010): 69–85.

fourth, and fifth Sundays of Lent (fols. 90–92),⁸¹ two gospels for an additional supplicatory service on Palm Sunday (96–99),⁸² and readings for the celebration of a Presanctified Liturgy on Good Friday (149).⁸³ The Synaxarion follows the cycle of readings for the year according to what it calls “the Greek rite” (161), from 1 September until 31 August.⁸⁴ The calendar is unusual in that it presents many saints twice, includes numerous feasts of enkainia (ἐγκαίνια), and commemorates saints in groups, collectively, such as the four Evangelists and the Old Testament Patriarchs.



Two sources examined above, Vat. Syr. 19 and Vat. Syr. 20, reveal a “mixed rite”—neither fully Constantinopolitan, nor completely local in character.⁸⁵ Although Vat. Syr. 19 was destined for use in ‘Abūd in Palestinian Samaria, both manuscripts originated in or near Antioch after Byzantine forces recaptured the region in 969. The victory rendered Antioch a second pole for the Byzantine Empire, a virtual capital of the Roman Orient.⁸⁶ But the rise of Antioch did not go unchecked by Constantinople, at least in ecclesiastical matters. Subsequent candidates for Patriarch of Antioch, such as the monk Theodore in the tenth century, were subjected to exams before the Constantinopolitan synod prior to their enthronement.⁸⁷ Later, Patriarch Agapius of Antioch (r. 978–996) was urged by the Byzantine emperor to resign as patriarch in exchange for a monastery in

Constantinople and a salary.⁸⁸ He was replaced on 4 October 996 by John, who had been chartophylax at Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. According to Yahyā al-Anṭakī, Patriarch John was to “bring order (*rattaba*) to the church of Cassian in Antioch, based on the model (*mithāl*) of St. Sophia in Constantinople.”⁸⁹ And so, with Byzantine imperial assent, the rite of Constantinople found its home in Antioch.

Arabic

Unlike Syriac manuscripts, Arabic liturgical sources are better representatives of the Jerusalem Patriarchate’s liturgical tradition. Apart from the bilingual Greek-Arabic manuscript Sin. Ar. 116 mentioned above, several Arabic Tetraevangelia, such as Sinaïticus Arabicus 54 (9th c.), Sinaïticus Arabicus 70 (9th–10th c.), Sinaïticus Arabicus 72 (897), Sinaïticus Arabicus 74 (9th c.), and Sinaïticus Arabicus 97 (1123/24) follow the Jerusalem lectionary order. These also include names for the locations of hagiopolite liturgical stations, which directly connect them with the liturgy of the city of Jerusalem.⁹⁰

Although Arabic lectionaries are extant from the ninth century onward, no complete set of liturgical texts in Arabic survives from before the thirteenth

81 Assemanus et al., *Bibliotheca apostolica*, 2:111–12.

82 Ibid., 2:112.

83 “Fer. 6. majori, ad consignationum Calicis, idest, ad Missam Præsanctificatorum”: ibid., 2:113.

84 “initium anni juxta Ritum Graecorum”: ibid., 2:114, 136.

85 Janeras also notes a mixed rite among Syriac sources for Good Friday. See Janeras, *Vendredi*, 39–40, 45.

86 G. Dagron, “Minorités ethniques et religieuses dans l’Orient byzantin à la fin du X^e et au XI^e siècle: L’immigration syrienne,” *TM* 6 (1976): 177–216, here 205.

87 n. 795, January 970: “Examen synodal de l’aptitude du moine Théodore, désigné par l’empereur pour être patriarche d’Antioche,” in V. Grumel, *Les Regestes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople*, vol. 1, *Les actes des patriarches*, fasc. 2–3: *Les registes de 715 à 1206*, ed. J. Darrouzès (Paris, 1989), 305. See also idem, “Le patriarcat et les patriarches d’Antioche sous la seconde domination byzantine, 969–1084,” *EO* 33 (1934): 129–47.

88 The name of the monastery is unclear, but Kratchkovsky and Vasiliev suggest it may have been Πικριδίου. See R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l’Empire byzantine*, part 1: *Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat œcuménique*, vol. 3, *Les églises et les monastères*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1969), 403–4.

89 *Histoire de Yahya-ibn-Sa’id d’Antioche, continuateur de Sa’id-ibn-Bitriq*, fasc. 2, ed. and trans. I. Kratchkovsky and A. Vasiliev, PO 23.3 (Paris, 1932), 445–46. My thanks to Dr. Jack Tannous for assistance with the Arabic. The church of Cassian (al-Qusyān in Arabic) was not the same as the Great Church of Antioch, but had assumed the status of the city’s cathedral, perhaps as early as the sixth century. For more on the Antiochene Church of Cassian, see W. Mayer and P. Allen, *The Churches of Syrian Antioch (300–638 CE)* (Leuven, 2012), 52–55, 174–82.

90 G. Garitte, “Les rubriques liturgiques de quelques anciens tétraévangiles arabes du Sinaï,” in *Scripta Disiecta*, vol. 2, 1941–1977, Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 22 (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1980), 722–37, originally published in *Mélanges liturgiques offerts au R. P. dom Bernard Botte à l’occasion du cinquantième anniversaire de son ordination sacerdotale (4 Juin 1972)* (Louvain, 1972), 151–66. For a list of hagiopolite liturgical stations, see S. Verhelst, “Les lieux de station du lectionnaire de Jérusalem, I^{ère} partie: Les villages et fondations,” *PrOC* 54 (2004): 13–70; idem, “Les lieux de station du lectionnaire de Jérusalem, II^{ème} partie: Les lieux saints,” *PrOC* 54 (2004): 247–89.

century. The absence of a full Arabic set supports the theory that during this period the Arabic-speaking community participated in either Greek or Syriac services, especially in monastic environments.⁹¹ According to this theory, Arab Christians required primarily scriptural texts (i.e. lectionaries) in order to serve the Liturgy of the Word in their own language, before joining the Greek service for the Eucharistic synaxis. Nevertheless, Joseph Nasrallah insists that hagiopolite Arabic liturgical books are scarcer due to the fact that Arabic was not used as a liturgical language in Jerusalem as much as it was used in Alexandria or Antioch; monasteries in Jerusalem favored Greek out of fidelity to Greek culture and to the Byzantine emperors.⁹²

Georgian

Perhaps the most significant hagiopolite liturgical material is found in the wealth of Georgian sources from the ninth century onward, yet much of it has never been studied.⁹³

There is a type of Georgian liturgical book that scholars have, for absence of a better title, labeled “liturgical collection” (ლიტურგიკული კრებული, *liturgikuli krebuli*; συλλογή λειτουργικῶν κειμένων).⁹⁴ These manuscripts contain, in the following order, JAS⁹⁵

in either long or short redaction;⁹⁶ the hagiopolite Presanctified (HagPRES);⁹⁷ assorted texts related to feast days, such as New Testament lections, chants, and prayers; and finally even some material proper to the Euchologion, such as agricultural blessings, orations for the sick, and prayers from the Liturgy of the Hours. That Georgian scholars do not call such liturgical collections Euchologia may be due to the fact that these books do not refer to themselves as such and do not contain material exclusively intended for the presiding bishop or presbyter.⁹⁸ Those with a connection to the Jerusalem lectionary through hagiopolite readings and commemorations include the Georgian liturgical collections listed below.

SINAITICUS IBERICUS N. 26 (9TH–10TH C.)

Believed to have originated in Palestine, Sin. Iber. N. 26 includes the long version of JAS, HagPRES, litanies (კვერექსები, *kverek'sebi*; ἐκτενεῖς, fols. 57v–70v), and dismissals (განტევებანი, *gantevebani*; ἀπολύσεις, 71r–97r), as well as psalms, chants, and New Testament readings for major feasts of the year according to the Jerusalem lectionary (97r–213v).⁹⁹

SINAITICUS IBERICUS N. 58 (9TH–10TH C.)

Sin. Iber. N. 58 contains the short redaction of JAS, New Testament lections for different feasts of the year (fols. 47r–58v), and a liturgical calendar according to the Jerusalem lectionary (59r–69r), along with the funeral rite (განგება, *gangeba*; ἀκολουθία) according to St. Sabas Lavra (69v–85v).¹⁰⁰

91 Leeming, “Adoption of Arabic,” 240–41.

92 Nasrallah, “Liturgie des Patriarcats melchites,” 159–60.

93 For a thorough overview of Georgian sources and previous studies, see S. S. R. Frøyshov, “The Georgian Witness to the Jerusalem Liturgy: New Sources and Studies,” in *Inquiries into Eastern Christian Worship: Selected Papers of the Second International Congress of the Society of Oriental Liturgy, Rome, 17–21 September 2008*, ed. B. Groen, S. Hawkes-Teeples, and S. Alexopoulos, Eastern Christian Studies 12 (Leuven, 2012), 227–67.

94 Z. Aleksidze, M. Shanidze, and L. Khevsuriani, *Catalogue of Georgian Manuscripts Discovered in 1975 at St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai*, trans. M. Shanidze (Athens, 2005). Those consulting this trilingual Greek, Georgian, and English language catalogue should be aware of crucial typographical errors. For example, Sinaiticus Ibericus N. 1 (11th c.), a copy of the eleventh-century Typikon of George Mtacmideli (the Hagiorite), is incorrectly given as tenth-century in English, but correctly as eleventh-century in the Greek and Georgian descriptions.

95 K. Kekelidze, *Литургические грузинские памятники в отечественных книгохранилищах и их научное значение* (Tbilisi, 1908), 1–22; Mercier, *Liturgie de Saint Jacques* (n. 24 above); Kazamias, *Θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ Ἁγίου Ἰακώβου* (see n. 49 above); *Liturgia ibero-graeca Sancti Iacobi: Editio–translatio–retroversio–commentarii*, *Jerusalem Theologisches Forum* 17 (Münster, 2011).

96 L. Khevsuriani, M. Shanidze, M. Kavtaria, and T. Tseradze, “The Old Georgian Version of the Liturgy of Saint James,” in *Liturgia ibero-graeca Sancti Iacobi*, 31.

97 Alexopoulos, *Presanctified Liturgy*, 107–12.

98 See P. Joannou, “Euchologion,” *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, ed. J. Höfer and K. Rahner, 2nd ed. (Freiburg, 1959), 3:1166–67; R. F. Taft, “Euchologion,” *ODB* 2:738; S. Parenti, “Euchologion,” *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, ed. W. Kasper, 3rd ed. (Freiburg, 1995), 3:976; idem, *L'eucologio slavo del Sinai nella storia dell'eucologio bizantino*, *Filologia Slava* 2 (Rome, 1997), 5–9; Frøyshov, “Georgian Witness,” 241–44.

99 Aleksidze et al., *Catalogue of Georgian Manuscripts*, 398–99; Khevsuriani et al., “Old Georgian Version,” 19.

100 Aleksidze et al., *Catalogue*, 417–18; Khevsuriani et al., “Old Georgian Version,” 18–19.

SINAITICUS IBERICUS N. 22 (10TH C.)

Apart from the long version of JAS, Sin. Iber. N. 22 preserves psalms and New Testament lections for general commemorations of saints following the hagiopolite lectionary (fols. 21r–79v).¹⁰¹

SINAITICUS IBERICUS N. 54 (10TH C.)

The long version of JAS, BAS,¹⁰² and CHR,¹⁰³ as well as psalms and New Testament readings for general commemorations of the hagiopolite liturgical year according to the Jerusalem lectionary (fols. 109r–129v), are found in Sin. Iber. N. 54.¹⁰⁴

SINAITICUS IBERICUS O. 54 (10TH C.)

Sin. Iber. O. 54, which originated in Palestine, includes the long form of JAS, HagPRES, litanies (fols. 13v–28v), dismissals (29r–56v), prayers for blessing objects at various feasts of the year (56v–66r), hymns, psalms, and New Testament lections for the liturgical year according to the Jerusalem lectionary (66r–175v). The manuscript is incomplete due to damage and now concludes with the rite for monastic tonsure.¹⁰⁵

SINAITICUS IBERICUS O. 12 (10TH–11TH C.)

Sin. Iber. O. 12 contains the short redaction of JAS, HagPRES, litanies (fols. 11r–34v), dismissals (35r–90r), blessings and sacraments, including baptism and marriage (90v–134r, 145v–168), prayers from the Liturgy of the Hours (135r–145v), psalms and New

Testament lections for the liturgical year, as well as general commemorations (191r–286r), all according to the Jerusalem lectionary.¹⁰⁶



Because of the potpourri of its contents and the compactness of its dimensions,¹⁰⁷ Outtier refers to this book type as a “missel de voyage.”¹⁰⁸ Much like the monastic *libelli missarum*, which concentrate liturgical action in the celebrant’s hands, liturgical collections are conveniently travel-sized and broad in scope.¹⁰⁹ While the Georgian liturgical collections were produced in monasteries, either at St. Sabas Lavra in Palestine or St. Catherine’s Monastery on Mount Sinai, the comparison with *libelli missarum* ends there. Georgian liturgical collections were not intended exclusively for a monastic community, as evidenced by the inclusion of marriage services and prayers for pregnant women in some of the manuscripts.

The contents of the liturgical collections are surprisingly faithful to the Jerusalem lectionary in their order and structure. The most complete example of the Liturgy of the Word from among the liturgical collections listed above is found in Sin. Iber. O. 54. The structure of the Liturgy of the Word is given as follows (normal type face indicates elements found in Sin. Iber. O. 54; boldface indicates elements from JAS; square brackets indicate elements from earlier sources of the Georgian lectionary no longer found in the liturgical collections):¹¹⁰

Introit Hymn (ობითად, *oxitay*)¹¹¹

101 Aleksidze et al., *Catalogue*, 396; Khevsuriani et al., “Old Georgian Version,” 24.

102 For the text of Georgian BAS, see N. Kajaia, ბასილი კესარიელის თხზულებათა ძველი ქართული თარგმანები [Old Georgian translations of the works of Basil of Caesarea] (Tbilisi, 1992), 260–317.

103 For the text of Georgian CHR, published by Tarchnishvili and Jacob with accompanying Latin translation, see M. Tarchnishvili, *Liturgiae Ibericae Antiquiores*, CSCO 122–23 (Louvain, 1950), 64–83; A. Jacob, “Une version géorgienne inédite de la liturgie de Saint Jean Chrysostome,” *Le Muséon* 77, nos. 1–2 (1964): 65–119.

104 Aleksidze et al., *Catalogue of Georgian Manuscripts*, 413–15; Khevsuriani et al., “Old Georgian Version,” 27.

105 ქართული ხელნაწერთა აღწერილობა: სინური კოლექცია [Description of Georgian manuscripts: Sinai collection], vol. 3, ed. R. Gvaramia, E. Metreveli, T. Chankievi, L. Khevsuriani, and L. Džgamaia (Tbilisi, 1987), 58–67; B. Outtier, “Un témoin partiel du Lectionnaire géorgien ancien (Sinai géorgien 54),” *Bedi Kartlisa* 39 (1981): 76–88; Khevsuriani et al., “Old Georgian Version,” 21.

106 ქართული ხელნაწერთა აღწერილობა: სინური კოლექცია, 3:33–47; B. Outtier, “Un nouveau témoin partiel du lectionnaire géorgien ancien (Sinai géorgien 12),” *Bedi Kartlisa* 41 (1983): 162–74; Khevsuriani et al., “Old Georgian Version,” 25.

107 The codices range from 20 × 15 cm to 5 × 9 cm.

108 Outtier, “Témoin partiel,” 76–88, here 88.

109 E. Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books from the Beginning to the Thirteenth Century*, trans. M. Beaumont (Collegeville, MN, 1998), 107, 109–10.

110 This order is based on Outtier, “Témoin partiel,” 79.

111 Technical term meaning “with incessant prayer” and comparable to a troparion. Etymologically, the Georgian term *ობითად* (*oxitay*) derives from *ობად* (*oxay*), which in turn is derived from the Greek *εὐχή*. See Leeb, *Gesänge*, 38–39; Kekelidze, *Иерусалимский Канонарь*, 335.

Trisagion

Psalm (ფსალმუნ-დასდებელი, *p'salmuni-dasdebeli*)¹¹²

[Old Testament readings]

New Testament reading

Alleluia

Gospel

Hymn for Hand Washing (ველთა-ბანისად, *xelta-banisa*)¹¹³

Hymn of the Holy Gifts (სიწმიდისად, *sicmidisa*)¹¹⁴

Anaphora

[Communion Hymn]

[Hymn after Communion]

[Dismissal (ერის განთევებად, *eris gant'eveba*)]

Sin. Iber. O. 54 prescribes this structure for all commemorations of the liturgical year, both for specific feasts and for general commemorations. Other liturgical collections begin the commemorations of the liturgical year either with the Nativity of Christ, in keeping with the order of the Georgian lectionary, or the Annunciation, according to the order of the hymnographic anthology known as the Tropologion, or *Iadgari* in Georgian.¹¹⁵ Despite the great degree of

112 Translated simply as “verse” but used in various contexts, such as the verse of a prokeimenon, a verse between stichera, or also for a troparion: Kekelidze, *Иерусалимский Канонарь*, 326.

113 Kekelidze originally believed this was a prayer of the presider while he washed his hands before the transfer of the gifts, but it is now understood to have been a hymn. See Kekelidze, *Иерусалимский Канонарь*, 342; Leeb, *Gesänge*, 99–113.

114 See n. 15 above.

115 E. Mer'aveli, C. Čank'ievi, and L. Xevsuriani, უძველესი იადგარი [The most ancient Iadgari] (Tbilisi, 1980); H. Métréveli, Ts. Tchankieva, and L. Khevsouriani, “Le plus ancien Tropologion géorgien,” *Bedi Kartlisa* 34 (1981): 54–62; A. Wade, “The Oldest Iadgari: The Jerusalem Tropologion, V–VIII c.,” *OCP* 50 (1984): 451–56; P. Jeffery, “The Sunday Office of Seventh-Century Jerusalem in the Georgian Chantbook (Iadgari): A Preliminary Report,” *Studia Liturgica* 21 (1991): 52–75; idem, “The Earliest Chant Repertory Recovered: The Georgian Witness to Jerusalem Chant,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 47 (1994): 1–38; C. Renoux, *Les hymnes de la résurrection*, vol. 1, *Hymnographie liturgique géorgienne: Textes du Sinaï 18* (Paris, 2000); idem, *Les hymnes de la résurrection*, vol. 2, *Hymnographie liturgique géorgienne: Textes des manuscrits Sinaï 40, 41 et 34*, PO 52.1 (Turnhout, 2012); idem, *Les hymnes de la*

variation among the liturgical collections, none of them contains any Old Testament lections, even though the older Georgian lectionary assigns multiple Old Testament lections in the Eucharistic liturgy for the same feasts (between the Psalm and the New Testament reading). Greek lectionaries of the same period also lack Old Testament readings at the Eucharistic liturgy. However, no Greek manuscripts survive to substantiate the theory that the Georgian liturgical collection book type was modeled on a Greek original, as was the Georgian lectionary. The only Greek manuscripts to preserve a structure of the Liturgy of the Word similar to the liturgical collections, including the Hymn for the Holy Gifts, are Petropolitanus RNB Gr. 44 (9th c.) and Sin. Gr. N.E. MG 8 (10th c.).¹¹⁶

Liturgical Books in Context

All but two of the liturgical manuscripts listed above, whether they represent monastic or cathedral practice, and regardless of the liturgical books they contain (i.e., Euchologion, hymn book, Gospel, Epistle, etc.), share a connection to the Jerusalem lectionary and calendar. The diverse content in these sources, and especially the variety of different prayers found in the Georgian liturgical collections, suggests they were copied for community use. But the presence of certain elements foreign to the hagiopolite liturgical tradition, such as BAS, CHR, and Constantinopolitan commemorations from the liturgical year, raises several questions about the chronological development of liturgy in Jerusalem and about the liturgy's connections with other centers of liturgical diffusion. An investigation of the liturgical texts listed above in their specific geographic, historical, and liturgical contexts should shed more light on these questions.

Liturgical Historiography

In an attempt to periodize the liturgical history of Jerusalem, Miguel Arranz and Alexey Pentkovsky

résurrection, vol. 3, *Hymnographie liturgique géorgienne: Introduction, traduction, annotation des manuscrits Sinaï 26 et 20 et index analytique des trois volumes*, PO 52.2 (Turnhout, 2012). The complete 1980 edition of the *Iadgari* is also available online: *The Most Ancient Hymn-Book*, ed. E. Kvirkevelia, C. Guledani, and J. Gippert, TITUS (Tbilisi-Frankfurt am Main, 2011). <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/ageo/liturg/udzviad/udzvi.htm> (accessed 21 March 2012).

116 See n. 53 above.

seek parallels between liturgical development in Constantinople and Jerusalem, dividing their liturgical history into periods based on significant events in each city's history. Arranz proposes that the Persian invasion of Jerusalem on 5 May 614, and the destruction of the Anastasis by Fatimid caliph al-Ḥākim bi'Amr Allāh (996–1021) on 28 September 1009, were cataclysmic events that immediately disrupted liturgical practice and ushered in a new type of liturgy.¹¹⁷ Pentkovsky argues that after the destruction of the Anastasis in 1009 the liturgy of Jerusalem was lost and replaced by that of Constantinople.¹¹⁸

Closer examination of the historical record shows these views to be oversimplified. Much of the destruction of churches and holy sites attributed to the Persians in 614 and to the Arabs in the years immediately following 638 actually occurred in the ninth century.¹¹⁹ Despite pillaging and burning the Anastasis and numerous other churches in Palestine, as described by Antiochus Strategos,¹²⁰ the Persians subsequently funded the complete restoration of the Anastasis, which was initiated by Patriarch Modestus (r. 630–634).¹²¹ Based on the lack of evidence of building activity after the Persians were driven out of Jerusalem, Robert Schick believes that more churches were restored during the early years of the Muslim conquest than during the brief period of Byzantine

recovery under Herakleios.¹²² Descriptions of the destruction of other churches, such as the Nea Church of the Theotokos,¹²³ were actually projections of more recent, ninth-century events by medieval historians (followed by some modern counterparts) onto the murky past.¹²⁴

The complex political situation in Jerusalem and the poorly understood history of the Anastasis Church complex in the tenth and eleventh centuries have also led to simplification.¹²⁵ The total destruction of the Anastasis in 1009 was certainly a traumatic event, but the church complex suffered extensive damage not long before, on 28 May 966, when it was burned. On this earlier occasion Patriarch John VII (964–966) was brutally murdered and his body burned in the atrium of the Martyrium.¹²⁶ Patriarch Christodoulos II (966–969) began restoration, which continued under Patriarchs Thomas II (969–979), Joseph II (980–984), Agapius (984–985), Orestes (986–1006) of Jerusalem, and Patriarch Arsenius of Alexandria (1000–1010).¹²⁷ The work was funded by Ibn al-Ḥammār, a Jacobite Christian, and later supervised by *synkellos* Ṣadaqah

117 M. Arranz, S.J., "Les grandes étapes de la liturgie byzantine: Palestine–Byzance–Russie: Essai d'aperçu historique," in *Liturgie de l'Église particulière et liturgie de l'église universelle*, BiblEphL 7 (Rome, 1976), 43–72.

118 A. Pentkovskii, "Константинопольский и иерусалимский богослужбные уставы," *ZhMP* (April 2001): 70–78.

119 K. Bieberstein, "Der Gesandtenaustausch zwischen Karl dem Grossen und Ḥārūn ar-Rašīd und seine Bedeutung für die Kirchen Jerusalems," *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 109 (1993): 151–73. For new seventh-century sources see L. Blancs, "Autour de quelques textes chrétiens concernant les premiers temps de la conquête musulmane," in *Byzance et ses périphéries: Hommage à Alain Ducellier*, ed. B. Doumerc and C. Picard (Toulouse, 2004), 41–55.

120 F. C. Conybeare, "Antiochus Strategos, The Capture of Jerusalem by the Persians in 614 AD," *EHR* 25 (1910): 502–17; A. Kazhdan, "Antiochus Strategos," *ODB* 1:119–20.

121 *The Armenian History attributed to Sebeos*, trans. R. W. Thomson, hist. commentary J. Howard-Johnston, assistance T. Greenwood, Translated Texts for Historians 31 (Liverpool, 1999), 70–72; "Иерусалим," *Православная Энциклопедия*, ed. S. L. Kravets (Moscow, 2000–), 20:397–445, here 413.

122 R. Schick, *The Christian Communities of Palestine from Byzantine to Islamic Rule: A Historical and Archaeological Study*, Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam 2 (Princeton, 1995), 65–66.

123 N. Avigad, "The Nea: Justinian's Church of St. Mary, Mother of God, Discovered in the Old City of Jerusalem," in *Ancient Churches Revealed*, ed. Y. Tsafrir (Jerusalem, 1993), 128–35.

124 Bieberstein, "Gesandtenaustausch," 159. See also S. Griffith, "What Has Constantinople To Do with Jerusalem? Palestine in the Ninth Century: Byzantine Orthodoxy in the World of Islam," in *Byzantium in the Ninth Century: Dead or Alive? Papers from the Thirtieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, Birmingham, March 1996, ed. L. Brubaker (Aldershot, 1998), 181–94.

125 See the recently-published proceedings of a 2009 conference held on this topic, *Konflikt und Bewältigung: Die Zerstörung der Grabeskirche zu Jerusalem im Jahre 1009*, ed. T. Pratsch, Millennium Studien zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr. 32 (Berlin, 2011).

126 *Histoire de Yahya-ibn-Sa'id d'Antioche, continuateur de Sa'id-ibn-Bitriq*, fasc. 5, ed. and trans. I. Kratchkovsky and A. Vasiliev, PO 18.1 (Paris, 1924), 708; Yaḥyā al-Anṭākī, *Cronache dell'Egitto fatimide e dell'impero Bizantino (937–1033)*, ed. and trans. B. Pirone, Patrimonio Culturale Arabo Cristiano 3 (Milan, 1998), 114–15.

127 Cf. "Patriarchae Hierosolymitani: 98.1.2 Hierosolyma, Aelia Capitolina, Urusalīm, al-Quds, Yarušalaym, Jerusalem, Gerusalemme," in Fedalto, *Hierarchia Ecclesiastica Orientalis*, 2:999–1005, for varying names and dates of the patriarchs in this period.

Ibn Bišr, with the result that it was “restored to its pristine splendor.”¹²⁸

The rise of caliph al-Ḥākim ushered in a period of Christian persecution during which churches were destroyed and ecclesiastical property confiscated.¹²⁹ The Anastasis itself was destroyed in 1009 “down to its foundations, except for that which was impossible to destroy or too difficult to carry away.”¹³⁰ That such destruction had a devastating impact on worship in Jerusalem is without question. Yet within two years the Christians received a direct order from local Bedouin emir al-Mufarriḡ Ibn al-Ḡarrāh¹³¹ to rebuild the Anastasis and were given a new patriarch, Theophilus I (1012–1020), to execute the order.¹³² Despite a devastating earthquake in 1033,¹³³ Byzantine-sponsored construction began in 1042 under Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–1055) and was supervised by the nobleman Ioannes Karianites. The Anastasis was rededicated only 39 years later, in 1048,¹³⁴ and adorned with opulent gifts from emperors Michael VI (1055–1057) and Michael VII (1071–1078).¹³⁵ Although the Martyrium was never rebuilt, the reconstructed Anastasis followed the fourth-century Constantinian plan and was an impressive structure by eleventh-century standards. Robert Ousterhout believes the rearrangement of reliquary chapels around the Anastasis reflected certain liturgical actions in

the *Typikon of the Anastasis*, particularly during the services of Good Friday and the procession with the Holy Cross.¹³⁶ While Dmitrievskii believed that the contents of the *Typikon of the Anastasis* could never have been used in 1122, the year in which it was copied,¹³⁷ the fact that the manuscript was copied by a lector of the Anastasis at the behest of “the pious George, archon and judge of the Holy City and sakellios (chartophylax) as well as great skeuophylax [of the Church] of the Holy Resurrection of Christ our God”¹³⁸—both intimately familiar with, and responsible for, the liturgical practices of the Anastasis—suggests otherwise. The manuscript should be considered a record rather than a historical artifact preserved for posterity.¹³⁹ Had the church not been appropriated by the Latin hierarchy accompanying the First Crusade in 1099, forcing the Greeks to play a secondary role in services at the Holy Sepulchre, the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem would likely have served Holy Week and Easter at the Anastasis in 1122 using the *Typikon of the Anastasis*.¹⁴⁰

The liturgical books examined above do not always fall neatly into the historical periods delineated by liturgists and do not themselves reveal a drastically different rite immediately after the year 1009. If the liturgical “changes,” as Pentkovsky calls them, resulted not from internal ecclesiastical and canonical regulation but as a result of external circumstances in the local environment, it is not surprising that diversity

128 “... il tetto della chiesa di san Costantino fu portato a termine ed essa venne restituita al suo pristino splendore: fu allora che la chiesa fu completata in ogni sua parte, poco tempo prima dell’ultima distruzione abbattutasi su di essa nel mese di *ṣafar* dell’anno 400 dell’egira”: Pirone, *Cronache*, 116.

129 M. Canard, “al-Ḥākim Bi-amr Allāh,” *EP*, 3:76–82, esp. 77–78 for a list of al-Ḥākim’s policies toward Christians.

130 Pirone, *Cronache*, 249.

131 M. Canard, “DJarrāhids or Banu ’l-Djarrāh,” *EP*, 2:482–85, esp. 483.

132 Pirone, *Cronache*, 258.

133 Ibid., 373–74.

134 Willelmi Tyrensis Archiepiscopi *Chronicon* 1.6, *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis* 63 (Turnhout, 1986), 112–14; translated into English as William, Archbishop of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, vol. 1, ed. and trans. E. Atwater Babcock and A. C. Krey (New York, 1943), 69–71. Yaḥyā al-Anṭakī’s history ends in 1033; thus he does not describe the completed restoration of the Anastasis.

135 R. Ousterhout, “Rebuilding the Temple: Constantine Monomachos and the Holy Sepulchre,” *JSAH* 48:1 (March 1989): 66–78, here 77 n. 40.

136 Papadopoulos-Kerameus, “Τυπικόν,” 144–47; Ousterhout, “Rebuilding,” 78.

137 Dmitrievskii, *Древнѣише*, 74–83. Dmitrievskii aims his criticism at Papadopoulos-Kerameus’s view that the manuscript reflects the actual practice of 1122 CE. See Papadopoulos-Kerameus, “Τυπικόν,” α’–θ’.

138 “Ἐκ(σθ)(η) ἡ δέλτος αὐτῇ κατὰ πρόσταξιν τοῦ εὐλαβοῦς Γεωργ(ιου), ἀρχων καὶ κριτ(ῆς) τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως καὶ σακελλίου [supra χαρτοφύλακος] τὲ καὶ μεγάλου σκευοφύ(λακος) τῆς ἁγίας Χ(ριστο)ῦ τοῦ Θ(εο)ῦ ἡμῶν Ἀναστά(σεως).” Hag. Stav. Gr. 43 (1122), fol. 152v; Papadopoulos-Kerameus, “Τυπικόν,” 252, with corrections from Dmitrievskii, *Древнѣише*, 59.

139 This is the view of scholars following Dmitrievskii, namely Bertonière, *Historical Development* (n. 11 above), 13–14; Janeras, *Vendredi*, 40.

140 For accounts of liturgical services at the Anastasis shortly after the arrival of the Crusaders, see *The Pilgrimage of the Russian Abbot Daniel in the Holy Land, 1106–1107 CE*, ed. C. W. Wilson (New York, 1971), 77–78. See also the entire issue of *PPSb* 106 (2008), dedicated to the millennium commemorations of Abbot Daniel’s pilgrimage.

and variation are present within the liturgical sources. The third principle of comparative liturgy attributed to Baumstark is that “the development of liturgy is but a series of individual developments” and the “history of the liturgy consists not in one progressive unilinear growth of entire rituals as single units, but via distinct developments of their individual components.”¹⁴¹ Baumstark’s third principle supports the conclusion that diversity and variation in liturgical manuscripts can be caused by external environmental factors.

Liturgical Synthesis

Turning to the individual components of the liturgical sources examined above, it becomes clear that the periodization frameworks proposed by Arranz and Pentkovsky require nuancing, not only from the perspective of history but also from the perspective of the study of liturgy. Although Jerusalem’s local liturgical tradition in the period of the Byzantine control of Palestine can be called pre-Byzantine, its liturgy had a greater role in the formation of the Byzantine Rite in Jerusalem’s post-Byzantine period, after the expulsion of the Byzantine Empire from Palestine as a result of the Arab conquest of Jerusalem.

The sources enumerated above derive from a formative period of the Byzantine Rite that underwent what has become known as the Studite and Sabaite synthesis. St. Theodore of Stoudios (759–826) initiated the fusion of the Constantinopolitan Euchologion¹⁴² with the Palestinian Horologion.¹⁴³ Cross-fertilization

occurred through a back-and-forth between Jerusalem and St. Sabas Lavra, between St. Sabas and the Studite monks in Bithynia-Constantinople, and between the Great Church of Constantinople and Studite monasteries.¹⁴⁴ Each center contributed various elements to the resulting synthetic whole. The synthesis was not a monolithic development and thus the process of synthesis must be examined according to its stages.

Byzantine Rite Horologia and liturgical Typika show the unmistakable influence of Jerusalem’s monasteries on Constantinople starting with the post-Iconoclast Studite synthesis and continuing until the neo-Sabaite synthesis disseminated these book types from Mount Athos.¹⁴⁵ However, it was the Constantinopolitan redaction of the Eucharistic liturgies in the Euchologion that was adopted in Jerusalem *tout court*, replacing the native hagiopolite Eucharistic JAS with the Constantinopolitan CHR and BAS. The Euchologion developed in Constantinople during this tenth-century reformation when the rise of Studite monasticism and its preference for CHR spread to the Constantinopolitan cathedral, and replaced the formerly dominant BAS. This change is reflected in various manuscripts where the order of the two liturgies becomes reversed: CHR is first and is served more frequently than BAS, which passes to second place and is reserved for more solemn feast days as well as the Sundays of Great Lent.¹⁴⁶ Of the hagiopolite liturgical books discussed here and dated to before the tenth century, none contains BAS or CHR. The absence of CHR and BAS until the tenth century suggests the Constantinopolitan Euchologion took time to arrive and to be accepted in Palestine. The single source noted

141 Although Taft attributes this “law” to Baumstark, neither he nor Fritz West are able to trace this reference to Baumstark’s publications. See R. F. Taft, S.J., “Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark (d. 1948): A Reply to Recent Critics,” *Worship* 73 (1999): 521–40, here 525; idem, “Anton Baumstark’s Comparative Liturgy Revisited,” in *Acts of the International Congress: Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark (1872–1948)*, Rome, 25–29 September 1998, ed. R. F. Taft, S.J., and G. Winkler, OCA 265 (Rome, 2001), 191–232, here 198.

142 M. Arranz, S.J., *L’Eucologio Costantinopolitano agli inizi del secolo XI* (Rome, 1996); Parenti, *L’Eucologio slavo* (n. 98 above); S. Parenti and E. Velkovska, eds., *L’Eucologio Barberini gr. 336*, 2nd rev. ed., BiblEphL 80 (Rome, 2000). See also the expanded introduction to the Russian edition of Barberinus Graecus 336 (8th c.) in *Евхологий Барберини гр. 336*, ed. E. Velkovska and S. Parenti (Omsk, 2011), 27–72.

143 J. Mateos, S.J., “Un Horologion inédit de Saint-Sabas: Le Codex sinaïtique grec 863 (IX^e siècle),” in *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, vol. 3, *Orient chrétien*, 1^{re} partie, ST 233 (Vatican City, 1964), 47–76; S. Parenti, “Un fascicolo ritrovato dell’*horologion*

Sinai gr. 863 (IX secolo),” *OCP* 75 (2009): 343–58. See also *A Christian Palestinian Syriac Horologion* (Berlin MS. Or. Oct. 1019), ed. M. Black (Cambridge, 1954); Frøyshov, “L’Horologe.”

144 R. F. Taft, S.J., *The Byzantine Rite: A Short History* (Collegeville, MN, 1992), 56–60; T. Pott, *Byzantine Liturgical Reform* (Crestwood, NY, 2011), 123, 164–65.

145 R. F. Taft, S.J., “Mount Athos: A Late Chapter in the History of the Byzantine Rite,” *DOP* 42 (1988): 179–94.

146 S. Parenti, “La ‘vittoria’ nella chiesa di Costantinopoli della liturgia di Crisostomo sulla liturgia di Basilio,” in Taft and Winkler, *Acts*, 907–28, here 927–28; revised and updated in idem, *A Oriente e Occidente di Costantinopoli: Temi e problemi liturgici di ieri e di oggi*, Monumenta Studia Instrumenta Liturgica 54 (Vatican City, 2010), 27–47, here 46–47.

above that contains all three of these liturgies, Sin. Iber. N. 54, still maintains JAS as the first liturgy.¹⁴⁷

Liturgical Substitution

The common thread linking the hagiopolite sources examined above is the Jerusalem lectionary, and yet liturgical calendars and lectionaries are not typically examined in studies of the Studite and Sabaite synthesis.¹⁴⁸ The earliest examples of calendars and lectionaries from Constantinople¹⁴⁹ and Jerusalem¹⁵⁰ represent two distinct traditions closely connected to the sacred topography of their respective cities and regions. The two traditions were originally shared between the cathedral and monasteries of each city. Only a few centuries later, monastic calendars and lectionaries from Constantinople¹⁵¹ and Jerusalem¹⁵² were identical to the earlier Constantinopolitan sources, stripped of all topographic references and local character.

This process of substituting hagiopolite liturgy with Constantinopolitan material has been labeled Byzantinization by liturgists who identified the phenomenon.¹⁵³ Although Constantinopolization

has also been suggested as a label, Byzantinization is preferred as a technical term because it acknowledges the synthetic nature of the Byzantine Rite that gradually came to dominate the liturgy of Jerusalem between the eighth and thirteenth centuries.¹⁵⁴

Krasnosel'tsev and Dmitrievskii held that Constantinopolitan liturgical texts, such as perhaps liturgical books already revised in Constantinople, permeated Jerusalem and the surrounding Palestinian monasteries during the reign of Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (r. 945–959).¹⁵⁵ Such an influx of Constantinopolitan material could account for the process of Byzantinization. But hagiopolite liturgical books from the tenth and eleventh centuries often exhibit a transitional character. The manuscripts reflect the copyists' awareness of two different rites—Constantinopolitan and Jerusalemite—each with its own distinct lectionary and calendar, but provide various ways in which differences were resolved. For example, Sinaiticus Graecus 1096 (12th–13th c.) is a liturgical typikon with a calendar that stipulates that the feast of St. Sabas on 5 December be celebrated with an octave.¹⁵⁶ Similarly, Dumbarton Oaks Ms. 2 (11th c.), a Georgian Menaion copied at the Monastery of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem, follows the calendar of the Great Church of Constantinople but adds commemorations for some Jerusalemite and Georgian saints.¹⁵⁷ While adopting the Constantinople rite, Sin. Gr. 1096 and Dumbarton Oaks Ms. 2 still retain local hagiopolite commemorations that are not celebrated in Constantinople. Sometimes a greater portion of the hagiopolite rite was retained in liturgical seasons considered especially solemn.¹⁵⁸ The gospel lectionary Sinaiticus Graecus 211 (9th c.) follows the Jerusalem cycle for Holy Week and Easter, and the Constantinopolitan cycle for the various saints whose

147 Although the Euchologion Sinaiticus Graecus N.E. MG 22 (9th–10th c.) contains both CHR and prayers that suggest a Middle-Eastern origin, it is not possible to determine its exact provenance. See G. Radle, "Sinai Greek NE/MG 22: Late 9th/Early 10th Century Euchology Testimony of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom and the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts in the Byzantine Tradition," *BollGrott* 3rd ser. 8 (2011): 169–221.

148 E. Velkovska, "The Liturgical Year in the East," in *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, vol. 5, *Liturgical Time and Space*, ed. A. J. Chupungco, O.S.B. (Collegeville, MN, 2000), 157–76, here 170–71. This is perhaps the only study to mention calendars and lectionaries within the context of the Studite and Sabaite synthesis, although Velkovska makes no reference to the authentic hagiopolite calendar.

149 Mateos, *Typicon*; G. Andreou, "Il Praxapostolos bizantino del secolo XI Vladimir 21/Savva 4 del Museo Storico di Mosca: Edizione e commento" (Doctoral diss., Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome, 2008).

150 See nn. 9 and 10 above.

151 Petras, *Typicon of the Patriarch* (see n. 78 above); Pentkovskii, *Типикон патриарха*.

152 Sin. Gr. 1096 (12th–13th c.). Dmitrievskii, *Описание*, 3:28–53.

153 The most notable include N. Krasnosel'tsev, review of A. A. Dmitrievskii (*Богослужение страстной и пасхальной седмицы во св. Иерусалиме IX–X в.* [Kazan, 1894]), *VizVrem* 2 (1895): 632–55; Charon, "Rite byzantine," 493–94; Nasrallah, "Liturgie des Patriarcats melchites," 157–58; Taft, *Byzantine Rite*, 64 n. 31; idem, "Liturgy," *OHBS*, 608.

154 I wish to thank Professors Ioli Kalavrezou (Harvard University) and Robert Taft (Pontificio Istituto Orientale) for their comments and suggestions regarding nomenclature.

155 Dmitrievskii, *Древнѣйшіе*, 65–67.

156 fols. 52v–53r. Dmitrievskii, *Описание*, 3:34–35.

157 For example, Bishop John of Jerusalem (16 December) and the Georgian Saints Abo (7 January) and Nino (14 January). See G. Garitte, "Le ménée géorgien de Dumbarton Oaks," *Le Muséon* 77, nos. 1–2 (1964): 29–64, here 37, 40, 48, 52–53.

158 A. Baumstark, *Comparative Liturgy*, rev. ed., ed. B. Botte, trans. F. L. Cross (Westminster, MD, 1958), 29–30.

relics were present in the imperial capital.¹⁵⁹ That such mixed rite sources exist in Greek,¹⁶⁰ Georgian,¹⁶¹ Syriac, and Arabic¹⁶² and originate from within the Patriarchate of Jerusalem confirms that the process of Byzantinization was a gradual phenomenon carried out at the local level.

Byzantine liturgical influence may have spread to Jerusalem through hagiopolite patriarchs exiled to Constantinople¹⁶³ or as a result of Byzantine canonists that promoted the model of New Rome throughout “all the Churches of God.”¹⁶⁴ Regardless, it is difficult to pinpoint how Byzantinization occurred. Although Constantinople certainly intended to impose its liturgy upon neighboring patriarchates, liturgical Byzantinization in Jerusalem does not appear to have been a consciously implemented campaign of Byzantine foreign policy.¹⁶⁵

Conclusions

Nuancing our knowledge of Jerusalem’s liturgy and history does not fully answer Krasnosel’shev’s questions about the motivation for revising liturgical manuscripts

after the Arab conquest, but it does advance our interpretation of data by identifying the pool of sources for the further study of hagiopolite liturgy. The above discussion suggests the following conclusions:

Elements of the distinct Jerusalem lectionary are found in a variety of liturgical sources, including lectionaries, Euchologia, and hymn books. This common thread uniting hagiopolite sources can be used as a criterion for determining liturgical provenance, alongside the methods of codicology and palaeography. Greek and Georgian liturgical manuscripts show the greatest faithfulness to the Jerusalem tradition in content, and their hagiopolite provenance is often simpler to establish through palaeographical and codicological evidence. The same can also be said for the Arabic sources mentioned above. Syriac sources, however, must be approached with caution. Their content is highly Byzantinized and often more closely connected with Antioch than with Jerusalem. Future studies of hagiopolite liturgy must consider liturgical manuscripts in each of these languages, just as codicologists have been led to consider manuscripts in each language in order to better understand the practice of manuscript production.¹⁶⁶

Structural units and their elements must be examined individually, rather than as a unity.¹⁶⁷ This prescription is especially applicable to the Georgian “liturgical collections,” which have a variety of elements. Understanding that “great problems are solved by being broken down into little problems” allows “the steady accumulation of little insights.”¹⁶⁸ The process of analyzing liturgical manuscripts is much like putting together a puzzle and filling in the numerous missing pieces using “intelligent guesses coherent with the whole.”¹⁶⁹

The content of each source must be understood in the context of Jerusalem’s dynamic interaction with Constantinople, either through the Studite and

159 “δέον γινώσκειν· ὅτι ἀπό δε ἄρχεται τὰ εὐαγγέλια κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως· ἀπο τῶν βατῶν ἐσπέρας τοῦ σαββάτου· καὶ μέχρι τοῦ ἁγίου σαββάτου ἐσπέρας τῆς λειτουργίας”: fol. 131v. See also Aland, *Kurzgefaßte*, 269.

160 Sin. Gr. 211 (9th c.) and Hag. Stav. Gr. 43 (1122) are good examples of mixed liturgical sources. See nn. 1, 11, and 155, above.

161 Garitte, *Calendrier* (n. 62 above).

162 Al-Birouni, *Les fêtes des Melchites* (n. 80 above).

163 The list of exiled hagiopolite patriarchs is incomplete. For one such case, see *The Life of Leontios Patriarch of Jerusalem*, ed. D. Tsougarakis, *The Medieval Mediterranean* 2 (Leiden, 1993).

164 “Διά τοι τοῦτο καὶ ὀφείλουσι πᾶσαι αἱ Ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀκολουθεῖν τῷ ἔθει τῆς νέας Ῥώμης, ἥτοι τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως”: Theodore Balsamon, *Ἐρώτησεις κανόνικαι*, PG 138:953D. See also Theodore Balsamon, *Λύσεις ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀπορίαις τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου πατριάρχου Ἀλεξανδρείας κῆρ Μάρκου . . .*, edited in *Νέα Βιβλιοθήκη ἐκκλησιαστικῶν συγγραμμάτων*, vol. 1, no. 1, ed. M. Gedeon (Constantinople, 1903); V. Grumel, “Les Réponses canoniques à Marc d’Alexandrie, leur caractère officiel, leur double redaction,” *EO* 38 (1939): 321–33.

165 C. Hannick, “Annexions et reconquêtes byzantines: Peut-on parler d’«uniatisme» byzantin?” *Irenikon* 66 (1993): 451–74. Canard shows the same to be true of supposed Byzantine cultural influences in Fātimid Egypt and North Africa. See M. Canard, “Le cérémonial fatimite et le cérémonial byzantin, essai de comparaison,” *Byzantion* 21 (1951): 355–420.

166 J. Gippert, “Towards a Typology of the Use of Coloured Ink in Old Georgian Manuscripts,” *Manuscript Cultures* 3 (2010): 2–13, here 13.

167 Taft, “Structural Analysis” (n. 4 above), 193.

168 B. Lonergan, S.J., *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, vol. 3, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, ed. F. E. Crowe and R. M. Doran (Toronto, 1992), 27.

169 R. F. Taft, S.J., *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, vol. 6, *The Communion, Thanksgiving, and Concluding Rites*, OCA 281 (Rome, 2008), 533.

Sabaite synthesis or via Byzantinization. Looking at liturgical sources within the framework of synthesis and substitution during this period renders a static pool of information a moving stream of investigation. New hagiopolite liturgical sources that come to light should also be considered within this dynamic interaction, and the new information they provide will be of great value in correcting and advancing what we know of the liturgy of post-Byzantine Jerusalem after the Arab conquest.

Daniel Galadza
 Institut für Historische Theologie
 – Liturgiewissenschaft und
 Sakramententheologie
 Universität Wien
 Schenkenstraße 8–10
 A–1010 Wien
 Austria
 daniel.galadza@univie.ac.at

☛ AN EARLIER DRAFT OF THIS ARTICLE WAS presented as a paper at the “Problems in the Early History of the Liturgy” Seminar at the North American Academy of Liturgy (NAAL) in Montreal, January 2012, during a junior fellowship in Byzantine Studies at the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection. Sincere thanks to the seminar members for their comments and to the Trustees of Harvard University for granting me the fellowship. I thank Archbishop Damianos of the Monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai and the monastery librarian, Fr. Justin, for the possibility to consult many of the Sinai manuscripts examined here. Finally, I would like to thank Margaret Mullett, Scott F. Johnson, and the two anonymous reviewers for their corrections and suggestions. All remaining errors are my own.